

Minutes

City of Loma Linda

Department of Community Development

Planning Commission

Chair Neff called a Adjourned Regular Meeting of the Planning Commission to order at 7:01 p.m., **Wednesday, March 17, 2004**, in the City Council Chambers, 25541 Barton Road, Loma Linda, California.

Commissioners Present: Randy Neff, Chair
Mary Lee Rosenbaum, Vice Chair
Michael Christianson

Commissioners Absent: Eric Essex
Shakil Patel

Staff Present: Deborah Woldruff, Director, Community Development
Rolland Crawford, Director/Fire Chief, Public Safety
Lori Lamson, Senior Planner
Jeff Peterson, Associate Engineer, Public Works Department
Allan Peñaflorida, Planning Tech
Jocelyne Larabie, Administrative Secretary

Consultant: Lloyd Zola, LSA Associates

ITEMS TO BE DELETED OR ADDED

There were no items to be added or deleted. However, Director Woldruff requested that the items be taken out of order to allow the applicant for Precise Plan of Design (PPD) No. 04-02 to leave once the item has been resolved, since the General Plan Update Project could result in a lengthy discussion. It was the consensus of the Planning Commission to address Item 2 under New Items, Public Hearing at the beginning of the meeting.

ORAL REPORTS/PUBLIC PARTICIPATION ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS

There were no oral reports.

CONTINUED ITEMS

PUBLIC HEARING

PC-04-18 - PRECISE PLAN OF DESIGN (PPD) 2004-0002 (PUBLIC HEARING - A proposal to demolish an existing single-family residence, and construct a two-story duplex on a 0.15-acre lot located at 11023 San Juan Street. The project includes a request for a Certificate of Appropriateness from the Historical Commission and City Council, and approval of a Minor Deviation.

Planning Technician Allan Peñaflorida gave the staff report and explained that the proposal submitted on January 15, 2004 consisted of the demolition and replacement of an existing single-family house with a new two-story duplex at a site located at 11023 San Juan Street, and a Minor Deviation requesting a reduction of the minimum vehicle setback of 24 feet to 22 feet 3 inches. He continued to say that because the house was more than 50 years old, the project was brought forward to the Historical Commission on March 8, 2004 to request a Certificate of Appropriateness to permit the demolition of the structure. Mr. Peñaflorida explained that as a result of the Historical Commission's review, a condition of approval, Condition No. 6, was added stating that all construction work would cease if historical and/or archaeological resources were discovered.

Mr. Peñaflorida continued his report stating that the following findings were made: 1) the proposed project is consistent with the existing draft General Plan and Zoning Designations, and in compliance with the R-2, Two-Family Residence zoning regulations; 2) the design of the proposed improvements would not likely cause substantial environmental damage or substantially and unavoidably injury to fish and wildlife or their habitat; 3) The design of the proposed improvements is not likely to cause serious public health problems.

Mr. Peñaflorida concluded his report stating that the applicant had worked closely with staff and made every effort to provide the most appropriate layout, design and architecture for the project. He informed the Commission that Mrs. Kaloshian was present to address any question that the Planning Commission might have.

Chair Neff opened the public comment period at 7:13 pm. As there were no comments, the public comment period was closed at 7:14 pm.

Chair Neff began the discussion of the project with the Conditions of Approval. He asked Associate Engineer Peterson if the construction of the duplex would entail an upgrade of sewer and water lines. Mr. Peterson explained that the existing water service would be abandoned and a new service better suited for a duplex would be installed; as for the sewer system, if a sewer connection existed it would need to be capped. He added that the comments from the Public Works Department would include the recycling of the any materials such as the foundation, etc as the building is being demolished. Chair Neff asked Mr. Peterson if those conditions could be included in the Conditions of Approval. Mr. Peterson agreed and stated that the requirements of the Public Works Department would be added to the Conditions of Approval.

Commissioner Rosenbaum suggested the addition of architectural elements to the windows to make the view from the street more appealing. Senior Planner Lamson pointed out that the window treatment was described in the elevations that show a foam trim around the window with cement applied to the foam. Commissioner Rosenbaum stated that from the street, there was quite a bit of wall space with the door being the only feature.

A discussion ensued regarding additional architectural features to give the house more curb appeal. Commissioner Christianson commented that the keystone archway over the front door and each window were suitable features for the architecture of the house. Commissioner Rosenbaum went on to point out on the landscape plans the proposed vegetation, which consisted of trees and shrubs. Commissioner Christianson commented that the proposed landscape was adequate to mitigate the concerns about the view from the street.

Chair Neff continued the discussion and asked if there was a need for additional fire protection. Senior Planner Lamson explained that fire sprinklers would be required for both residences and that the Public Safety Department was not requiring any additional safety measures for mitigation.

Commissioner Christianson asked if the driveway was flat or if there will be a grade to it. Mr. Peterson replied that during the grading process, the plan check indicated that there would be a slight grade towards the street and precise grading would be necessary to redirect the runoff around the structures.

Commissioner Christianson asked where the trash container would be stored. Ms. Lamson replied that the side yard was five feet of paved area where the trashcans could be kept. She continued to say that the Commission could require that a gate be added with some type of access to the rear and front yard areas. Staff agreed to add a condition stating that the trashcans must have an area where they could be stored.

Mr. Peñaflorida brought the full size plans for Commissioner Rosenbaum to see what the species of plants and shrubs were planned for the property.

While Commissioners Rosenbaum and Christianson reviewed the plans, Chair Neff continued the discussion of the Conditions of Approval and suggested that Condition #3 be modified to adjust the time frame when construction could occur.

Condition 3 would read:

During site construction the project shall comply with the Section 9.20.050 (Prohibited Noises) of the Loma Linda Municipal Code, which requires that construction activities cease between the hours of 7:00 p.m. and 7:00 a.m.

After reviewing full sized landscape plans, Commissioner Rosenbaum was satisfied that there were sufficient landscape to address her concerns regarding the front elevation and the curb appeal.

Chair Neff had a question regarding improvements within the street right-of-way relative to the removing or replacing sidewalks, curbs, gutters, etc. Associate Engineer Peterson replied that the issue would be addressed during the grading plan process but he added that a condition could be added to the Conditions of Approval to say that any damaged improvements would be improved or replaced to City standards.

Commissioner Christianson asked if it was absolutely necessary to remove the mature tree on the front of the house. The applicant replied that the tree was a hazard and had to be removed. Commissioner Christianson continued to ask where the trash containers would be placed. Senior Planner Lamson reiterated that the Commission could have a requirement that would show the placement of the trash containers in the side yard on the plans. She added that, as discussed earlier, a new condition would be added to that effect.

Commissioner Rosenbaum discussed Condition #4 regarding relating to trim and stucco colors. Mr. Peñaflorida explained that several color options had been discussed with the applicant. Director Woldruff added that staff was concerned that the basic stucco color was too bland and staff requested that more contrast be selected for the trim to make the house stand out better. Commissioner Christianson received confirmation that the roofing material was manufactured tile and added that the dark brown of the roof contrasted well with the overall color of the building. Ms. Lamson commented that the color of the trim and the stucco were too similar and staff would prefer a warmer color and would work with the applicant to get the correct combination.

Chair Neff requested clarification on the next stage of the process. Senior Planner Lamson explained that the City Council had to approve the Certificate of Appropriateness, but during that time, the applicant could submit full drawings and grading plan for plan check requirement prior to the issuance of the building permit.

Motion by Christianson, seconded by Rosenbaum, and carried by a vote of 3-0 to approve Precise Plan of Design (PPD) 04-02 and the Minor Deviation based on the findings and subject to the Conditions of Approval with amendments noted. (Patel & Essex absent)

PC-04-19 - GENERAL PLAN UPDATE PROJECT - The project is a comprehensive update to the City's General Plan, which was originally adopted in 1973. A Draft General Plan document has been prepared based on public input received in various public workshops over the past two years. The draft document has been designed to respond to and reflect the City's changing conditions and community goals in order to guide the City's development during the next twenty years. The project boundaries include all of the City's corporate limits and the Sphere of Influence in the San Bernardino County unincorporated areas generally located south of Redlands Boulevard, east of California Street, south of Barton Road and west of the San Timoteo Creek Channel, and the southeast portion of the South Hills area into San Timoteo Canyon and south to the Riverside County line. The Draft General Plan document addresses issues and sets broad policies related to Land Use, Community Design, Circulation, Economic Development, Housing, Conservation, Open Space, Noise, Safety, Public Services and Facilities, and Historic Preservation.

Director Woldruff gave a brief update on the project. She said that the second public hearing on the General Plan was on March 3, 2004 when staff provided a recap on the February 11, 2004 meeting. She continued to say that the Commission had received testimony at that meeting mostly concerning the draft policy for the hillside mixed-use land use designation. Ms Woldruff explained that staff suggested that any responses to comments and revisions to the Draft General Plan that might result in public comment be deferred until all public testimony was received and that the Planning Commission concurred with staff.

Director Woldruff reported that the Planning Commission had concluded the review of the Land Use Element and the review of the Community Design Element – Element 3, up to Section 3.1.6. She explained that the discussion would resume with Section 3.1.6 and cover Element 1 - Introduction to the General Plan, Element 4 - Economic Development Element, the Transportation and Circulation Element – Element 6, and if time permits the Noise Element – Element 7.

Director Woldruff informed the Commission that staff had received a request to have a workshop on the Hillside Mixed-Use, which was forwarded to the City Council where it was approved. She continued to say that staff was working to set a date for a Joint workshop between the Planning Commission and City Council and would poll the Commissioners for their availability.

Director Woldruff requested that if there was going to be a special workshop to discuss the Hillside land use, and that if the Planning Commission accepted testimony on the South Hills that the it be limited to three minutes per speaker.

Director Woldruff introduced Mr. Lloyd Zola, LSA Associates and asked Mr. Zola if he wished to add any comments to her summary of the last meeting on March 3, 2004.

Chair Neff pointed out that the discussion would begin with 3.1.6 – Large Office and Business Park Development. He asked Mr. Zola to give an example of this type of development. Mr. Zola replied that that type of development was not very common in Loma Linda and would be a cluster of larger complexes in some of the mixed-use areas. Director Woldruff added that these policies could apply to the Corporate Business Center, if the remaining land would be developed.

The following sections were reviewed and discussed:

- 3.1.6.1 – Implementing Policies for Large Office And Business Park Development
 - (c) – Design of a business complex located with a small building on the corner... Mr. Zola explained that a smaller building on the corner would allow a better view of the other building in the complex.

The words “To Improve Line of Sight” would be added at the end of 3.1.6.1 (c).

- (d) – Limit building height in a business park to a maximum of five stories ... Commissioner Rosenbaum wanted to know where and how tall would a signature building be located. Mr. Zola replied that each case would be reviewed on a case-by-case basis.

A brief discussion on the design of parking lots and their landscaping was held. Mr. Zola replied that the objective be defined to break up the linear expanse of asphalt.

Mr. Dick Wiley, 10848 Pepper Way, in reference to item (c) above, suggested that a patio with trees to front the building or plaza.

Chair Neff acknowledged that the Planning Commission was hearing public testimony.

- 3.1.7 – Institutional Development

Commissioner Christianson entered into a discussion with Mr. Bob Frost, Director of Loma Linda University regarding the development of the Master Plan for the Loma Linda University Medical Center running parallel with the City’s General Plan. Director Woldruff interjected that the discussion was not appropriate as it was not an item on the agenda. She added that this particular section of the General Plan covered many types of institutional buildings. She assured the Commission that they would have the opportunity to discuss the University’s Master Plan in the near future. Mr. Zola commented that this section of the draft General Plan focused on different aspects than the mixed-use and institutional designations of the Land Use Element.

A discussion commenced regarding the integration of the community, the sensitivity to the surrounding areas and the incorporation of additional facilities to encourage the livable/walkable community concept. Mr. Zola explained that the purpose of this policy was to minimize the impacts to the surrounding neighborhood when a hospital, medical facility or any type of institution is designed.

- 3.1.7.1 – Implementing Policies for Institutional Development

Chair Neff stated that he would like to see an item added to the Implementing Policies to provide for the amenities that would meet the demand for other types of activities. Mr. Zola explained that the design issue was the pedestrian connection to the uses that may be adjacent to the institution.

Director Woldruff and Mr. Zola agreed that an item (h) could be added to address linkages to the surrounding areas in the Implementing Policies for the Institutional Development section.

- 3.1.8.1 – Guiding Policies for Industrial Development

Change the word “prohibit” to “avoid” in item (f).

Item 3.1.8.1 (f) would read:

Avoid the use of unpainted, bare metal and highly polished metal materials.

- 3.1.9.1(a) of the Implementing Policies for Residential Development

Commissioner Rosenbaum commented that the words used in that item had different meaning making it confusing for the reader.

Mr. Zola agreed that each word referred to a different concept and that stated that he would correct the language to reflect those meanings.

Chair Neff took the opportunity to direct staff to provide Mr. Zola with the Developer Checklist to ensure that they are present in the language of the draft General Plan.

- 3.1.9.1 (d)

Commissioner Rosenbaum requested clarification regarding the “lot patterns that reflect the existing topography” and how it relates to a distinct character for each neighborhood.

Mr. Zola explained that the idea was to vary the shape and pattern of the lots to meet the topography and that it would be possible to move it to a separate item in the list.

- 3.1.9.1 (p)

In response to Commissioner Rosenbaum’s question, Mr. Zola replied that he would revise the language to identify the circumstances under which you would want to required “reduced front setbacks” mentioned in the first part of the item.

There was a brief discussion regarding traffic calming using speed “humps” and “bumps”. Assistant Engineer Peterson explained that there have been studies with speed bumps and the results were not the ones that were expected. Motorists tend to speed up between the bumps because they perceive a loss of time slowing down for them.

- 3.1.9.1 (o)

Chair Neff commented that he would like to see more custom homes in the city. Mr. Zola explained that in most cases the city, as the Redevelopment Agency, seeks out developers to do custom construction because the tract builder would not incorporate this concept in tract housing. One course of action could be for the Planning Commission to require more variety in house types in tracts.

Director Woldruff suggested changing the word “encourage” to “promote” in item (o) and, as Mr. Zola suggested, requiring that more house types be proposed in subdivisions.

As a result of a lengthy discussion, the Commission suggested that custom homes be encouraged in the implementing policies.

- 3.1.9.2 – Guiding Policy for Hillside Mixed Use

Director Woldruff requested that the discussion on this section be deferred to the Joint City Council/Planning Commission workshop. Commissioner Christianson stated that he would read his statement into the record at the joint workshop.

- 3.2.1 – Implementing Policy for Adaptive Reuse and Preservation with New Development

Commissioner Christianson commented that this section was the subject of discussion at the time of the development of the Mission Road Overlay District.

- 3.2.1 (c)(d)

Mr. Wiley commented that the orange trees moved to Leonard Bailey Park were not of good stock and the City was not able to save them. He added that if trees of healthier stock were moved at the right time in their cycle, the trees would survive.

Chair Neff summarized the discussion to say that the preservation and maintenance of orange groves was in important element of the General Plan to retain the citrus heritage of Loma Linda.

- 3.3.1 – Places to Strengthen Design

Commissioner Christianson commented that the City’s entry signs should be standardized.

- 3.3.1.3 – Loma Linda University and Area

The word “surrounding” will be added to the title of the section.

- 3.3.2.6 – Public Art

Commissioner Christianson requested a discussion on the type of Public Art and where it should be displayed. Mr. Zola stated that public art did not necessarily need to be an artistic statement; it can be something to draw visual attention such as a mural.

Mr. Wiley suggested that some thought might be given to color code buildings etc. that would relate parking areas to a matching color for the building.

The result of the discussion was the addition of the word “encourage” or “promote” to 3.3.2.6 – Public Art.

- 3.3.2.7 (c) – Guiding Policy regarding Design Elements to Improve Community Design

Commissioner Rosenbaum discussed the use of banners for advertising and their maintenance.

Mr. Zola suggested that provisions be made for the maintenance of flags and flags as they are approved for advertising of different events.

Chair Neff stated that the discussion of signage concluded the review of Element 3.

Director Woldruff explained the continuing process for the adoption of the draft General Plan and draft EIR. She informed the Commission that the draft EIR was ready to be release for its 45-day review period that will end on May 6, 2004. She continued to say that the document would not be distributed to the Planning Commission in a formal public hearing until after the review period was completed. She added that the Commissioners would be provided with the Traffic Model with the copy of the EIR.

There was a discussion in regards to the next opportunity to review other elements of the General Plan. Director Woldruff stated that the City Council wished to have a joint workshop and added that there would be other items that would need review in April and a full agenda for the first meeting in May.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes available for approval.

REPORTS BY THE PLANNING COMMISSIONERS

There were no reports by the Commissioners.

COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT DIRECTOR REPORT

There were no reports by Director Woldruff. Senior Planner added that there was a large influx of new projects and that the Planning Commission meetings would be very busy through April, May, June, July and August.

ADJOURNMENT

Motion by Rosenbaum, seconded by Christianson, and unanimously carried to adjourn the discussion of the General Plan to a special meeting on March 31, 2004. (Patel and Essex absent)

The meeting was adjourned at 10 p.m.

Minutes approved at the regular meeting of July 7, 2004.

Administrative Secretary